

California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990

Programmatic Accomplishments

Fiscal Year 1995-96

INTRODUCTION

In June of 1990, the voters of California passed Proposition 117, the California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990, commonly referred to as Proposition 117, or the Mountain Lion Initiative. The Act states that " . . . there is an urgent need to protect the rapidly disappearing wildlife habitats that supports California's unique and varied wildlife resources."

To assure the preservation of a unique habitat, the Act created the Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF); required an annual transfer of \$30 million into the Fund until the year 2020; and specified how the monies were to be expended for acquiring, restoring and enhancing habitat necessary to protect wildlife and plant populations, especially deer, mountain lions, rare, endangered, threatened or fully protected species, wetlands, riparian and aquatic habitat.

Specifically, the Act requires that \$4.5 million be appropriated to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). Of this amount, \$1.5 million shall be expended on projects that are located in the Santa Lucia Mountain Range in Monterey County; \$1.0 million shall be expended for acquisitions in, and adjacent to units of the state park system; and the remaining \$2.0 million shall be used for 50 percent matching grants to local agencies for projects meeting requirements of the Act, and, for the acquisition of wildlife corridors and urban trails, nature interpretative programs, and other programs designed to bring urban residents into park and wildlife areas.

The Act also requires that \$4.0 million be appropriated to the California Coastal Conservancy (CCC); \$10.0 million to the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy (SMMC), until July 1, 1995, after which the Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) shall be the recipient of these funds; \$500,000 to the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC); and the balance of the fund, or an additional \$11.0 million to the WCB.

EXPENDITURE REQUIREMENTS

To assure critical habitat is acquired, restored and/or enhanced, Section 2786 of the Act specifies that funds are to be expended on (a) the acquisition of habitat, including native oak woodlands for the protection of deer and mountain lions; (b) the acquisition of habitat to protect rare, endangered, threatened, or fully protected species; (c) the acquisition of habitat for Significant Natural Areas, (d) the acquisition, enhancement, or restoration of wetlands; (e) the acquisition, enhancement, or restoration of aquatic habitat for spawning and rearing of anadromous salmonids and trout resources; and, (f) the acquisition,

restoration, or enhancement of riparian habitat.

Further complicating the expenditure requirements, the Act requires that over a 24-month period, to the extent practicable, expenditures should be made to achieve the following: (1) that 1/3 of the total expenditures are to be made for acquisitions of habitat necessary to protect deer and mountain lions; and the remaining 2/3 of the expenditures shall be made for acquisitions of habitat to protect rare, endangered, threatened, or fully protected species; (2) that \$6.0 million be expended on the acquisition, restoration, or enhancement of wetlands, and \$6.0 million be expended on the acquisition, restoration, or enhancement of aquatic and riparian habitat, and (3) that 50 percent of the expenditures be made in Northern California and 50 percent of the expenditures be made in Southern California.

This report summarizes the expenditures made from the HCF during 24-month period covering Fiscal Year 1994-95 and 1995-96. In addition, this report provides a complete listing of projects approved for funding by each of the participating entities during Fiscal Year 1995-96.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

While the expenditures can be summarized into the six major habitat categories identified in the Act, i.e., Section 2786 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), many expenditures qualify for more than one program elements or habitats as defined in the program. For example, \$1.0 million could be expended for purposes of acquiring 50 acres to protect deer and mountain lions as defined in Section 2786 (a). That same 50 acres; however, may provide quality habitat for a rare, threatened or fully protected species, as defined in Section 2786 (b).

Stated differently, natural ecosystems are made up of a multitude of plants, animals, birds, reptiles, insects, etc., interacting with the natural elements as a whole system. Consequently, it is to be expected that some habitat protection efforts will contain more than one defined program element. When acquiring or restoring land, a parcel will be classified for a primary habitat value. Since natural areas are rarely monotypic, a second or even third program element may be present and will appropriately be given credit under the program.

Herein lies one of the major difficulties in reporting how funds are expended. To the extent possible, expenditures were reported for an individual and unique habitat that met one of the definitions of Section 2786. However, in several cases, the same funds were reported as expenditures for multiple types of habitat that met more than one of the definitions of how funds could be expended. Because of the identified multiple wildlife benefits, the reporting of funds by specific categories becomes more complicated.

HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND EXPENDITURES

To better understand the accomplishments that were achieved from the expenditure of HCF monies, Table 1 summarizes the type and number of acres protected or restored and the dollars expended to protect, restore or enhance these acres. In addition, Table 2 summarizes the expenditures made by each of the participating entities and the purpose for

which the expenditures were made. Table 3 provides a summary of habitat acres protected and restored since 1990, and Table 4 summarizes the protection and restoration efforts over the last 24-month funding cycle.

Table 1
Type of Habitat Protected
1995-96
(\$ in 000s)

	Deer & Lion Habitat	Rare & Endang Species	Signif. Natural Areas	Wetland Habitat	Aquatic Habitat	Riparian Habitat	Urban Trails	Habitat Links
Funds Expended	\$1,323	\$4,642	\$2,566	\$4,428	\$480	\$3,255	\$3,865	\$250
Acres Protected	1,507	2,661	1,074	6520 ^{1/}	4.5mi ^{2/}	5,208 ^{3/}	227	^{4/}

1/ Planning is currently underway for the restoration of 105 sq.mi.of wetland habitat.

2/ Planning is currently underway for 109 sq.miles of aquatic habitat.

3/ An additional 14.5 miles of riparian habitat was restored.

4/ Acres were not reported.

Table 2
Agency
Habitat Protection Expenditures
1995-96
(\$ in 000s)

Agency	Deer & Lion Habitat	Rare & Endang Species	Signif. Natural Areas	Wetland Habitat	Aquatic Habitat	Riparian Habitat	Urban Trails	Habitat Links
CCC	---	1,850	---	810	100	540	3615	---
WCB	175	2,242	2,366	3,057	333	1,774	---	---
DPR	1,148	550	200	495	---	704	250	250
CTC	---	---	---	66	47	237	---	---

Total	\$1,323	\$4,642	\$2,566	\$4,428	\$ 480	\$3,255	\$3,865	\$ 250
--------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------	----------------	---------------

Table 3
Type of Habitat Protected
1990 to Present
(\$ in 000s)

	Deer & Lion Habitat	Rare & Endang Species	Signif. Natural Areas	Wetland Habitat	Aquatic Habitat	Riparian Habitat	Urban Trails	Habitat Links
Funds Expende d	\$26,084	\$54,779	\$12,438	\$31,783	\$17,769	\$26,137	\$66,125	\$35,761
Acres Protecte d	21,295	25,669	8,790	87,238	9,689	50,662	28,901	19,270

Table 4
Habitat Protection Efforts
Over 24-Month
Funding Cycle
(\$ in 000)

	1/3	1/3	1/3	\$6M	\$3M	\$3M
	Deer & Lion Habitat	Rare & Endangered Species	Significant Natural Areas	Wetland Habitat	Aquatic Habitat	Riparian Habitat
Funds Expende d	\$4,977	\$7,819	\$7,301	\$11,772	\$7,045	\$10,371
Acres Protected	6,355	4,681	2,288	10,062	2,403	9,424

As previously mentioned, the Act also requires that 50 percent of the funds be expended in

Northern California and 50 percent in Southern California, as defined. For FY 1995-96, the data reported reflects a total of \$24.7 million expended from the Habitat Conservation Fund. Of this amount, \$14.7 million was expended in Northern California and \$3.4 million was expended in Southern California. In addition, \$6.6 million was appropriated to the WCB for expenditure by other departments.

Budget Bill Language directed the WCB as to where and how the monies were to be expended by the other departments.

As such, WCB does not know where these monies were expended with respect to the requirements of the Act, that 50 percent be expended in Northern California and 50 percent in Southern California.

Specifically, the Budget Bill Language required that \$.970 million was made available to the Department of Water Resources, \$.140 million was made available to the Department of Conservation, and \$5.492 million was made available to the Department of Fish and Game. This report only identifies the amount of monies transferred to other departments.

The Act also states that, "to the extent practicable, . . . all agencies expending funds should use the services of the California Conservation Corps and local community conservation corps."

Of the 49 projects reported, only three used the services of the California Conservation Corps. This low participation rate could be attributed to the nature of the projects reported. Most of the funds appear to have been expended on acquisition projects. As such, the acquisition process is not compatible with the services provided by the California Conservation Corps.

Section 2794 requires that any state or local agency that manages lands acquired with funds appropriated from the HCF shall prepare, with full public participation, a management plan for lands acquired. Based upon the reported information, 61 percent of the projects indicated that a management plan had been prepared. It should be noted, that many reported projects reflect an expansion of an existing public area and/or are included in a project area plan that contains an operational and management element.

To further understand how the funds were expended by each of the participating entities, the following section provides a summary of projects funded in FY 1995-96.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

Funds Appropriated:\$20,685,000

Funds Expended: \$13,950,000

Acquisition Projects (Fee or Easement)

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Cosumnes River WLA, Exp.2	1,765	1,020	Sacramento
Red Lake WLA	375	^{1/}	Alpine
Noyes Valley WLA, Exp.4	4	3,852	Siskiyou
Watsonville WLA	56	13	Santa Cruz
San Jacinto WLA	475	121	Riverside
Ash Creek WLA	677	739	Lassen & Modoc
Honcut Creek	95	384	Yuba & Butte
Clover Swale	175	1,226	Modoc
SF Bay WLA	1,800	835	Alameda
Sequan Peak ER	10	125	San Diego
McClusky Slough ER	257	43	Monterey
Battle Creel WLA	126	47	Tehama
Blue Sky ER	360	95	San Diego

Restoration and/or Enhancement Projects

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Mud Slough Drainage	34	2800	Merced
Thermalito Afterbay	94	400	Butte
Tulare Basin	26	320	Tulare
N. Sacramento Valley	136	645	Colusa, Glenn, Tehama
Pickle Meadow WLA	50	8	Mono
M&T Pump & Fish Screen	500	^{2/}	Butte
Scott River Riparian	333	4.5 miles ^{3/}	Siskiyou

1/ Purchase of water rights, acreage not included in totals.

2/ Fish friendly water made available for wetlands.

3/ Square miles not included in acreage totals.

Wildlife Conservation Board, continued

In addition to the above-mentioned expenditures, the WCB was appropriated \$6.602 million to be transferred to the following departments for the specified habitat activities:

1. Department of Water Resources (\$970,000):

Trinity River Fish & Wildlife Restoration Program	350,000
San Joaquin River Management Program	200,000
Upper Sacramento River Habitat & Riparian Plan	300,000
San Joaquin Valley Drainage Relief Program	120,000

2. Department of Conservation (\$140,000):

Agricultural Land Stewardship Program	140,000
---------------------------------------	---------

3. Department of Fish and Game (5,492,000):

Habitat Restoration	1,300,000
Comprehensive Wetland Program	1,500,000
Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area	636,000
Natural Communities Conservation Planning	210,000
Napa Wetlands	196,000
Environmental Enhancement Project	460,000
Waterfowl Lease Program	200,000
Salmon & Steelhead Restoration	990,000

CALIFORNIA COASTAL CONSERVANCY

Funds Appropriated: \$4,000,000

Funds Expended: \$6,815,000

Acquisition Projects (fee or easement)

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Spring Ranch	2,265	162	Mendocino

Restoration and/or Enhancement Projects

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Napa River Watershed ^{1/}	100	462 ^{2/}	Napa & Solano
Sand City Dunes ^{1/}	2,250	200	Monterey
Morro Bay Watershed	400	85	San Luis Obispo
Wilcox Property	1,700	65	Santa Barbara
Malibu Lagoon Watershed ^{1/}	100	105 ^{2/}	Los Angeles

1/ Enhancement plan preparation.

2/ Square miles, not included in total acreage count.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Funds Appropriated: \$4,500,000

Funds Expended: \$3,572,000

State Park Projects (Acquisitions):

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Anderson Marsh	50	51	Lake
Donner Park	52	17	Placer
Point Lobos	1,500	^{1/}	Monterey

Department of Parks and Recreation, continued

Local Assistance Projects:

Acquisition Projects (fee or easement)

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Henningsen Lotus Park	100	11	El Dorado
Rancho Ventana	290	103	Monterey
Modjeska Canyon	130	12	Orange
Soda Springs	212	77	Santa Clara
Pine Hill ER	100	17	El Dorado
Santa Susana	64	10	Ventura
Whittier Hills	100	97	Los Angeles
Lynch Canyon	100	163	Solano
Rodman Ranch	112	32	Lake
Whitter	100	51	Los Angeles

Restoration and/or Enhancement

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Sulphur Creek	75	2/	Orange
Mission Trails	50	2/	San Diego
Telcolote Canyon	17	2/	San Diego
Los Penasquitos	50	2/	San Diego
Aquatic Park	50	2/	Alameda

Local Assistance Projects:

Acquisition Projects (fee or easement)

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Porter Ranch	225	980	Contra Costa
Laguna Laurel	195	162	Orange

1/ Acres reported in 1994-95, installment payment.

2/ Restoration effort, acres not reported.

CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Funds Appropriated: \$500,000

Funds Expended: \$350,000

Restoration and/or Enhancement Projects

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>P-117 \$</u> (\$ in 000s)	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Location/County</u>
Washoe Meadows-Plan	300	1/	El Dorado
Pre-Project Design	50	2/	Placer & El Dorado

1/ Project acres reported in 1994-95 initial effort.

2/ Expenditures for project planning and design.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the information and data provided to the WCB by the agencies appropriated funds from the HCF, the Wildlife Protection Act of 1990 is protecting critical habitat in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the Act.

As previously mentioned, \$24.7 million was expended from the HCF to acquire, restore and/or enhance 14,968± acres of critical habitat. Another unique finding revealed that approximately \$2.4 million was expended to develop watershed enhancement plans for approximately 571 square miles of deer, oak woodlands and lion habitat, habitat for rare and threatened species, wetland and riparian habitat and critical wildlife corridors throughout the State of California.

In addition, it appears that urban trails and/or efforts designed to join or link critical habitat areas remains a high priority effort for many agencies receiving monies from the HCF as a greater emphasis continues to be made on providing public access and urban trails designed to bring urban residents into park and wildlife areas. This is especially encouraging as more citizens of California will have access to and benefit from our natural resources.

Collectively, the provisions of the Wildlife Protection Act of 1990 are protecting, restoring and enhancing critical wildlife habitat and fisheries in California. As the population of California continues to grow, it is reassuring to know that the provisions of this Act are preserving and protecting the rapidly disappearing unique and varied wildlife resources that the citizens of California have grown to cherish.

Habitat Protection Efforts
Over 24-Month
Funding Cycle
(\$ in 000)

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	1/3	1/3	1/3	\$6M	\$3M	\$3M
	Deer & Lion Habitat	Rare & Endangered Species	Significant Natural Areas	Wetland Habitat	Aquatic Habitat	Riparian Habitat
\$ Expend						
1995-96	\$4,977	\$7,819	\$7,301	\$11,772	\$7,045	\$10,371
1997-98						
Total:						
Acres Protected	6,355	4,681	2,288	10,062	2,403	9,424